REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

The rejection of claims 1-5 and 16-19 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Cloke is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 features retrieving a first portion of the recorded data via the bus and updating some of the registers via the bus. The claimed bus is exemplified in Fig. 3 of the present invention as bus 360.

The Office Action contends that Cloke shows data are conveyed to HIDC 32 from channel 26 by bus 36 and that some of the registers in channel 26 are updated using bus 36. That contention is incorrect. Cloke at col. 22, lines 32-37, teaches the following:

> Use of separate I/O ports for data transfer and microprocessor 34 access to register set 122 also permits high speed data transfer to occur without interruption via port 40 despite concurrent lower speed data transfers between register set 122 and microprocessor 34 via microprocessor port 120.

(Emphasis added.) This means that bus 36, contrary to the Office Action's contention, does not transfer data between HIDC 32 and channel 26. Instead, data is transferred between HIDC 32 and channel 26 using channel data bus 38. See Cloke col. 10, lines 27-29 and lines 54-57; col. 11, lines 1-5; and col. 12, lines 26-31.

Since buses 36 and 38 do not identically show the bus of claim 1, claim 1 is not anticipated and is therefore allowable. Claims 2-5 are also allowable due to their dependency on allowable claim 1.

Claim 16 features providing data via a bus and updating at least one register or parameter via the bus. As explained above, Cloke uses two buses instead of the one bus claimed. Claim 16 is then allowable since Cloke does not identically show the bus of claim 16. As such, claim 16 is allowable along with dependent claims 17-19.

The rejection of claims 6-15 and 20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cloke in view of Bowes et al. is respectfully traversed.

Claim 6 features values indexed by zone. The Office Action contends that this is disclosed in Cloke at col. 30, lines 33-53 and col. 32, lines 38-47. That contention is incorrect. Those citations nowhere explicitly teach or suggest that claim feature. In addition, the Office Action does not provide any objective evidence that (1) the knowledge of a skilled artisan, (2)

the problem to be solved by the inventors of the present invention, or (3) the applied references, the knowledge of a skilled artisan and the problem to be solved by the inventors of the present invention as a whole would motivate the skilled artisan to combine Cloke with Bowes et al. so that values indexed by zone would be included.

Without such explicit teaching or suggestion, or objective evidence, this rejection of claim 6 cannot be supported. Thus, claim 6 is not obvious and is allowable. Claims 7-14 are also allowable due to their dependence on allowable claim 6.

Claim 15 features a memory containing several values indexed by zone identifiers. The Office Action contends this feature is disclosed in Cloke at col. 12, lines 1-9. That contention is incorrect. Those citations nowhere explicitly teach or suggest that claim feature. In addition, the Office Action does not provide any objective evidence that (1) the knowledge of a skilled artisan, (2) the problem to be solved by the inventors of the present invention, or (3) the applied references, the knowledge of a skilled artisan and the problem to be solved by the inventors of the present invention as a whole would motivate the skilled artisan to combine Cloke with Bowes et al. as featured in claim 15. Without such explicit teaching or suggestion, or objective evidence, this rejection of claim 15 cannot be supported. Thus, claim 15 is not obvious and is allowable.

Claim 20 depends from claim 16. Claim 16 features providing data via a bus and updating at least one register or parameter via the bus. Claim 16 is not anticipated by Cloke as explained above. Nor does Cloke teach or suggest that feature. And Bowes et al. do not anticipate that feature as explained in previous responses. In fact, Bowes et al. do not teach or suggest that feature. Since Claim 16 is not obvious in view of both those references, it is allowable. Claim 20 is also allowable due to its dependency on allowable claim 16.

As explained above, all the pending claims are patentable over the applied references. The examiner is respectfully requested to allow all the pending claims and new claims 16-20, and pass this case to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

SEAGATE TECHNOLOGY LLC
(Assignee of Entire Interest)

_3/4/05_
Date

David K. Lucente, Reg. No. 36,202
SEAGATE TECHNOLOGY LLC
Intellectual Property Dept. – COL2LGL
389 Disc Drive
Longmont, Colorado 80503
(720) 684-2295 (telephone)
(720) 684-2588 (facsimile)